

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JOEL STEDMAN, on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated, and KAREN
JOYCE, on behalf of herself and all others
similarly situated,
Plaintiffs,

v.

PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE
COMPANY, a foreign automobile insurance
company,
Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:18-cv-1254

MINUTE ORDER

The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable Jamal N. Whitehead, United States District Judge:

The parties have not provided any indication that they have or intend to comply with the notice requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1715. This statute requires Defendant to serve notice of the proposed class settlement “upon the appropriate State official of each State in which a class member resides and the appropriate Federal official[.]” 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b). This must be done “[n]ot later than 10 days after a proposed settlement of a class action is filed in court.” *Id.* The contents of the notice are set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b). And “[a]n order giving final approval of a proposed settlement may not be issued earlier than 90 days after the later of the dates on

1 which the appropriate Federal official and the appropriate State official are served with the notice
2 required under subsection (b).” 28 U.S.C. § 1715(d).

3 Accordingly, the Court STRIKES the parties’ Stipulated Motion for Preliminary
4 Approval and orders the parties to refile the motion. The Court ORDERS Defendant to serve
5 notice as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b) by no later than ten days from the date class settlement
6 papers are refiled. Defendant must file proof of timely notice with the Court. The Court may
7 decline to approve the settlement if the parties fail to comply with this statute.

8 The Court also STRIKES the Fairness Hearing previously scheduled for January 17,
9 2024.

10 Dated this 7th day of September, 2023.

11 Ravi Subramanian
12 Clerk
13 /s/ Serge Bodnarchuk
14 Deputy Clerk
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24